

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/501,933	10/27/2004	Donna L. Mendrick	OCIM-002/15US 309602-2082	7118	
58249 COOLEY GO	7590 06/29/2009 DWARD KRONISH LI	EXAMINER			
ATTN: Patent		RIGGS II, LARRY D			
Suite 1100 777 - 6th Stree	et, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20001		1631		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/29/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/501,933	MENDRICK ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LARRY D. RIGGS II	1631		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	ED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date thave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of valued or 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter							
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi			арреал оптов а				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	·						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be They raise new issues that would require further core They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying the	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reject	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11	16 and 41.33(a)).						
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 	See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s). 		•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) thou the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 70-79.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration.		•					

See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. ☐ Other:

/LDR/ Larry Riggs

/ERIC S. DEJONG/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicants proposed after Final amendment contains proposed amendments to claims comprising the new limitation of having liver tissue or liver cells not exposed to a hepatotoxin. Therefore, the proposed after Final amendment, if entered would require further search and/or consideration and will not be entered.

Continuation of Item 11 NOTE:

The rejections and/or objections set forth in the Final Office action, mailed 02/04/2009 are maintained for reasons of record.

Claims 70-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, First paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirment.

Claims 70-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph as being indefinite.

Claims 70-79 are provisonally rejected under obvious-type double patenting of applications 10/515,373, 11/547,759, 12/043,666, 12/181,020, 12/256,225.

Applicants arguments filed 06/04/2009 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

In regard to the rejection of claims under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph, applicants argue that the current rejections are traversed based on the current amendments and because a similar application with a similar rejection under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph is now a US patent. In regard to the rejection of claims under 35 USC 112, Second paragraph, applicants argue that the current rejections are traversed based on the current amendments. In regard to the rejection of claims under obvious-type double patenting, applicants argue that a terminal disclaimer of one of the cited applications has been approved.

Applicants arguments have been considered but are not persuasive because they are directed to claim amendments that have not been entered. As such, applicants arguments are not persuasive with respect to the latest claims of record, filed 04/28/2008.

Applicants submission of a terminal disclaimer, filed 04/28/2009, if entered would be sufficient to overcome the obvious-type double patenting rejections.